ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS.

PRESIDENT : As I said yesterday certain number of adjournment motions were handed to me and I find that today also I am in receipt of some more of the kind. The first of them is in the name of Mr. Jebamony Nadar. It reads,

> "That the business of this Chamber be adjourned for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the recent Nair-Ezhava Conference held at the official residence of the Dewan and the impression that it has produced in the minds of those loyal subjects of His Gracious Highness the Maharaja who belong to the minority communities".

I hold that the motion proposed is in order. But I wish to know whether the member has the leave of the House to move the adjournment motion.

MR. KAINIKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Changanachery* cum *Peermade*): Sir, I object.

PRESIDENT : As the rule requires that 14 members should stand up in favour of the motion and as 2 members alone have voted for the motion, it cannot be allowed for discussion in the House.

The next motion stands in the name of Mr. K. Narayanaperumal Nadar. It reads,

> "I intend to move a motion for the adjournment of the business of the House for the purpose of discussing a matter of recent and urgent public importance, namely, the serious situation created in the State, by the Chief Secretary's unconvincing reply on the 18th September 1939 to the State Congress President's letter seeking a resumption of the talk on constitutional reforms with the Dewan".

PRESIDENT : I hold that the motion is in order. But I would like to have the opinion of the House as to whether the member has the leave of the House to move the motion.

MR. PADIYARA JOSEPH KUNJU (*Changanachery* cum *Peermade*) : Sir, I object.

PRESIDENT : Since the requisite number of members has not supported the moving of the motion as per the rules, the motion is inadmissable.

The third motion stands in the name of Mr. M. R. Narayana Pillai. There are three other motions dealing with the same subject. I shall give the text of them one by one. The first is,

> "I beg leave to move for the adjournment of the business of the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the strenuous efforts on the part of the decree-holders to expedite sales of immovables and other properties and the execution of decrees of courts in view of the sudden postponement of the introduction of the Debt Relief Bill which postponement has caused great discontent throughout the country"

Mr. G. Velu Pillai's motion is,

> "I beg leave to move for the adjournment of the business of the House to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the serious situation arising out of the postponement of the introduction of the Travancore Debt Relief Bill in the Sri Mulam Assembly."

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. Padiyara Joseph Kunju's motions are these:

"I beg leave to move the adjournment of the business of the House to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the dropping of the Travancore Debt Relief Bill from the agenda of this meeting of the Sri Mulam Assembly."

"I move that the business of the House be adjourned to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the situation created by the delay in introducing necessary legislation regarding debt relief although it was included in the original agenda of the business of this session of the Assembly."

These are the motions relating to the Debt Relief Bill. I hold that the motions are in order. Does anybody object?

(There was no dissenting voice.)

I hold that the motions are in order and they will be discussed this afternoon.

I have received another motion from Mr. T. P. Velayudhan Pillai. It is as follows:—

"I beg leave to move the adjournment of the business of the House to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, *viz.*, the serious situation arising from the Notification R. O. C. No. 589/39/C. S., dated 18th September 1939, regarding the "General Holidays" and "Special Holidays" for the State, and class of persons or communities, respectively".

I hold that the motion is in order and it will be discussed tomorrow at 3.30 p. m.

There is another motion by Mr. P. S. Muhamed, which reads thus:—

"I move that the business of the day be adjourned for the purpose of discussing the situation created by the declaration of plague infection in certain areas of the State and the difficulties and hardships caused to the merchants and the people as a result of the measures taken by the authorities in the name of plague".

I do not know whether it will be to the interest of the State that we should discuss the whole details of the plague situation. But if all that is required is an account or a general idea of what is being done by Government, I think it will be possible to make the matter clear. I hold that the motion is in order and I am prepared to give a day for its discussion. But after knowing the policy of the Government and what has been done by them till now, the mover of the motion may not like to divide the House on that point.

The question of plague is a serious one. There are signs of plague in Quilon and Alleppey. So far as our information goes, those symptoms have been due to infection from outside places. We are not perfectly sure what those outside places are. But all indications point out that rat-falls have occurred in godowns where goods have been brought and stored from Cochin. Therefore the natural presumption is that it is the rice and other materials coming from Cochin that bring in plague into this State. Fortunately the ravages of plague have not been severe so far. I am able to assure the House that the information that we have is that the situation is well under control both at Alleppey and Quilon. It has unfortunately become necessary to restrict the movement of boats and *valloms* in consequence of the cyanogassing. I am glad to assure the House that it has been found possible by negoti-

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ations to make it easy for the Travancore Health Department to inspect the cyanogassing done in Mattancherry itself. Hereafter it would not be necessary to stop any boat or *vallom* because arrangements are made at Mattancherry, for cyanogassing with the co-operation and in the presence of Cochin and Travancore officials. So far as the present difficulty of congestion in boats are concerned, it is a lamentable fact. Certain orders have been issued and instructions given with regard to this matter. I realise that it is not the difficulty of private individuals alone but also of the State. Honourable members will realise that lessening the number of boats bringing imports, makes for a decrease in the number of boats available for exports. It should be remembered that one of our main sources of income is export duty. So it is not in the interests of the State to keep those boats and *vallams* hanging about for long. Every step will be taken to reduce the delay. I do not think any amount of precaution, however confronted with temporary losses, is too much for the purpose of preventing plague which has been kept away from our shores for so long a time. Bearing that point in mind I would ask the member in charge of the motion whether he wants to go on with the motion.

MR. P. S. MUHAMED (*Quilon* cum *Kottarakara*): No, Sir. I wish to withdraw the motion.

(The motion was withdrawn.)

MR. C. JEBAMONY NADAR: Sir, I rise to a point of order. Rule 20 of the Legislative Rules says :—

> "A motion for an adjournment of business of either Chamber for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance may be made with the consent of the President."

Then Standing order No. 14 says :—

> "Leave to make a motion for an adjournment of the business of the Assembly for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance must be asked for after questions and before the list of business for the day is entered upon."

These rules, I take it, refer to the asking of leave at two stages, one from the President and the other from the House. Now, under the rules, all notices have to be left with the Secretary. Supposing a member who has so left a notice of adjournment motion does not get the consent of the President at or before question time or supposing no intimation is communicated to him, can it be a case of want of diligence on the part of the honourable member if he does not get up to move the motion soon after question time? I wish to know also as to the time and manner of obtaining the consent of the President.

PRESIDENT: There is a certain amount of confusion in the matter. Standing Order No. 49 prescribes the condition precedent to the operation of the rule, *viz.*, that the motion for adjournment when sent in will not be read by the President unless he gives consent to it. When these motions are left with the Secretary and if the honourable member is in his place and it is clear that he is anxious to

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[President.]

move the motion, then the further procedure begins to operate. Supposing it is against public interests to advert the motion in the House, then it will never come before the House. When it comes before the House and the President reads it, it means that he has given consent to it. That alone is not enough. It is open to the President to stand on technicalities and say that the honourable member should ask for leave to make the motion. That is the correct technical rule. But that rule has not been strictly adhered to here. By convention it is taken for granted that he makes the motion for leave and thereupon the President gives his ruling. If the rule is to be strictly adhered to, then, after question time the honourable member should get up in his seat and say that he wishes to make an adjournment motion and then the President will say that he has received notice of an adjournment motion before giving consent for the motion being made. If the honourable members, by general consent, want the full process to be gone through, there is no objection to follow the rules in their logical conclusions.

MR. C. JEBAMONY NADAR: Supposing the President does not read the adjournment motion. In that case can it be said that the member in charge of the motion was not vigilent in standing up and asking for leave to make the motion?

PRESIDENT: I do not know what the learned member is referring to. He is probably referring to some observations of mine or that of the honourable Deputy President. The honourable member who has sat down just now is right in saying that yesterday a mistake was committed by the Chair in so far as the Chair did not announce that notice of a motion for adjournment has been received before the occupant of the Chair withdrew. To that extent, the honourable member is prefectly right.

The House will now resume discussion of the Audit Report and Appropriation Accounts.

DISCUSSION OF THE REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE—(*contd.*)

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI (*Tiruvalla*): Sir, the reply given by the Financial Secretary regarding the violation of the rule laid in Article 930 of the Financial and Account Code, Part I, by all Heads of Departments except the Financial Secretary was neither convincing nor satisfactory. In regard to the invariable violations of this Rule, the Financial Secretary used to assure the House on similar previous occasions also that he would see that the mistake was not committed in future. But a comparison of the Audit Report and Appropriation Accounts, for the year 1113 with that of the year 1112 will show that the result was becoming worse and worse. When at least three of the Heads of Departments complied with this rule in 1112, it will be seen from the Audit Report of the year 1113 that no other departmental

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly